

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA  
CEDAR RAPIDS DIVISION**

MARY JANE MARION,

Plaintiff,

vs.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL  
SECURITY,

Defendant.

No. 19-CV-76-LRR

**ORDER**

The matter before the court is United States Magistrate Judge Mark A. Roberts's Report and Recommendation (docket no. 22). The Report and Recommendation recommends that the court affirm in part and reverse and remand in part the final decision of Defendant Commissioner of Social Security ("Commissioner") denying Plaintiff Mary Jane Marion's daughter Janet L. Marion's application for Title II disability insurance benefits.<sup>1</sup>

On July 12, 2019, Janet L. Marion filed a Complaint (docket no. 4) requesting judicial review of the Commissioner's decision to deny her application for disability insurance benefits. On October 2, 2019, the Commissioner filed an Answer (docket no. 8). The matter was briefed and, on March 16, 2020, was referred to Judge Roberts for issuance of a report and recommendation pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). *See* Plaintiff's Brief (docket no. 14); Defendant's Brief (docket no. 15); Plaintiff's Reply (docket no. 20). On April 21, 2020, Judge Roberts issued the Report and Recommendation. In the Report and Recommendation, Judge Roberts advised the parties

---

<sup>1</sup> On March 9, 2020, the court entered an Order (docket no. 17) substituting Mary Jane Marion as Plaintiff for Janet L. Marion, who died on December 8, 2019. *See* March 9, 2020 Order at 1.

that they “must file objections to [the] Report and Recommendation within fourteen (14) days of the service of [the] Report and Recommendation[.]” Report and Recommendation at 54. Neither party has filed objections to the Report and Recommendation, and the time for doing so has passed.

Pursuant to statute, this court’s standard of review for a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation is as follows:

A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made. A judge of the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.

28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Similarly, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b) provides for de novo review of a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation on dispositive motions when objections are made. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). The Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals has held that it is reversible error for a district court to fail to conduct a de novo review of a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation when such review is required. *See, e.g., United States v. Lothridge*, 324 F.3d 599, 600 (8th Cir. 2003). The court reviews the unobjected-to portions of the proposed findings or recommendations for “plain error.” *See United States v. Rodriguez*, 484 F.3d 1006, 1010-11 (8th Cir. 2007) (noting that, where a party does not file objections to a magistrate’s report and recommendation, the party waives the right to de novo review and the court will review the decision for plain error).

In this case, no objections have been filed, and it appears to the court upon review of Judge Roberts’s findings and conclusions that there is no ground to reject or modify them. Therefore, the court **ACCEPTS** Judge Roberts’s Report and Recommendation of April 21, 2020. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation (docket no. 22) is **ADOPTED** and the final decision of the Commissioner is **AFFIRMED in part** and **REVERSED and REMANDED in part** in accordance with the Report and Recommendation.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**DATED** this 13th day of May, 2020.



LINDA R. READE, JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA